UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,997	03/05/2002	Andrew Cleasby	CISCO-5029	6400

28661 7590 02/28/2006

SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.
1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202
Minden, NV 89423

EXAMINER	
SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELMI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/091,997	CLEASBY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Salad E. Abdullahi	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response

1. The response filed on 11/28/2005 has been received and made of record.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are not persuasive for the following reasons.

Applicant seems to be arguing no suggestion to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Bakshi discloses receiving, by at least one client, a parser from a server (see fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 21-47) and parsing the received content by said at least one client (see fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 21-47). Bakshi is silent regarding: reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client. However, Petty discloses a content parsing system parsing content for display at the client device including reconstructing (i.e., rendering) said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client (see fig. 10 and col. 10, lines 20-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Petty into the system of Bakshi to generate the received content in a proper format for display to user.

Also, applicant seems arguing the references individually.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Furthermore, Petty discloses "Note that framework 1000 can be executed in a web browser, with the run-time managers 126 residing on a web server in archived form. In this scenario, when a user links to a web page that incorporates a Java applet developed using the PDML framework, the archived class library is downloaded to the web client, and all parsing and rendering is performed in the browser's execution space" which clearly indicates reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client (col. 10, lines 20-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakshi et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,772,200[herein after Bakshi] in view of Petty et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,342,907[hereinafter Petty].

As per claims 1, 14, and 24, Bakshi discloses a method of parsing content received by at least one client coupled to a server, said method comprising:

receiving, by at least one client, a parser from a server (see fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 21-47);

parsing the received content by said at least one client (see fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 21-47).

Bakshi is silent regarding: reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client.

Petty discloses a content parsing system parsing content for display at the client device including reconstructing (i.e., rendering) said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client (see fig. 10 and col. 10, lines 20-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Petty into the system of Bakshi to generate the received content in a proper format for display to user.

As per claim 2, 15 and 25, Petty discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said parser is received by said at least one client as a collection of Java classes and a serialized Java object (see col. 7, lines 7-22).

As per claims 3-4,16-17 and 26-27, Petty discloses the method of claim 2, further including the acts of:

parsing said received content using a Java portion of the client-side parser (see col. 7, lines 7-22); and

placing a call, as needed, into JavaScript for a rule script (see col. 7, lines 7-22).

As per claims 5-13, 18-23 and 28-33 Bakshi discloses the method of claim 3, further including the acts of:

selecting, by said at least one client, a parsing object corresponding to said received content, said parsing object containing at least one parsing rule having at least one expression (see fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 21-47); and

parsing, by said at least one client, said content according to said at least one parsing rule (see fig. 6 and col. 7, lines 21-47).

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300.**

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abdullahi Salad
Primary examiner
2/21/2006